

hopes and dreams for the future of their country. We have learned on our trips that nothing is more important for global security than the development of human capital, and what better example could there be than these remarkable girls.

I want to echo the sentiments of Afghanistan's First Lady and say to the girls, "Saar Bolan demoom kar deen," literally, "You make us hold our heads up high." We are proud of you.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that, when these girls were born, women were not allowed to get an education in Afghanistan. Now, because of the bravery of these girls and the tireless efforts of their teachers, the rest of the world can now see how remarkable Afghan women truly are.

Congratulations on your remarkable achievement.

CHIEF JAMES CARMODY, WYOMING, MICHIGAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, MICHIGAN POLICE CHIEF OF THE YEAR

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a humble public servant and someone, frankly, I am proud to call a friend, Chief James Carmody of the Wyoming, Michigan, Police Department, who was recently named Michigan Police Chief of the Year.

Jim Carmody began his career in 1975 as a police officer in Port Huron, Michigan, where he rose to the rank of deputy chief. In 2006, Jim made the decision to join the Wyoming Police Department as chief and call west Michigan home.

Chief Carmody has led the charge to strengthen the relationship between police officers and the community that they serve, while providing the residents of Wyoming, Michigan, with top-notch law enforcement.

Chief Carmody's relentless commitment to public safety doesn't end there. He also chairs the Michigan Police Chiefs' Traffic Safety Committee and was recently appointed to serve on the Governor's Traffic Safety Commission.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Second District of Michigan, I congratulate Chief Carmody on being named the top Michigan Police Chief for 2016. We thank him for his 42—and keep counting—years of service to Michigan and to our Nation.

CONGRATULATING VIRGIN ISLANDS WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM, AND THANKING RAKEEM CHRISTMAS AND THE CHRISTIANSTED HILLSIDERS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate the Virgin Islands women's basketball team on winning the gold medal at the 2017 Centrobasket Championship and finishing the tournament with a 4-1 record. They beat out teams from Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean.

I particularly want to congratulate Natalie Day, who was named MVP, with a tournament double-double average, 18.6 points and 11 rebounds per game.

Good luck to the Virgin Islands women's team at the FIBA Women's AmeriCup 2017 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. We are rooting for you.

I also want to congratulate another Virgin Islander, Rakeem Christmas, who, for the last 2 years, has played center for the NBA's Indiana Pacers.

I want to thank Rakeem for returning home to St. Croix repeatedly and hosting a series of youth events, and for opening a basketball court funded by his foundation for the Frederiksted Boys and Girls Club. He and other athletes will coach basketball camps on St. Thomas and St. Croix this week, with the highlight of an all-star competition on St. Croix's Educational Complex.

Finally, to the Hillsiders, who host their annual picnic this weekend, thank you so much for continuing the tradition of the Hillsiders of Christiansted. I will be there to celebrate with you as we remember culture and family, united in pride and hope.

RISING MEDICAL PREMIUMS

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago The Washington Times published a chart from the Department of Health and Human Services showing that medical premiums went up 116 percent last year in Arizona, 69 percent in Oklahoma, 63 percent in my home State of Tennessee, 59 percent in Minnesota, 58 percent in Alaska, and on and on and on.

President Obama promised, if we would pass his healthcare bill, that people could keep their plans, yet millions were forced onto ObamaCare because either their premiums went up too high or they lost their insurance altogether. He promised that the average family would save \$2,500 a year. It has been almost impossible to find any family that has saved that \$2,500.

ObamaCare has been great: great in making healthcare unaffordable for almost every family in America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2910, PROMOTING INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2883, PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 218, KING COVE ROAD LAND EXCHANGE ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 454 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 454

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-28. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2883) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for

the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 218) to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-27. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the re-

port equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 20, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 2825) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Friday, July 21, 2017, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 454, which provides a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act; H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act; and H.R. 218, the King Cove Road Land Exchange Act.

Mr. Speaker, our domestic energy industry has suffered greatly over the last 8 years under outdated regulations and burdensome bureaucratic red tape that have prohibited growth and innovation. Today's rule allows for consideration of two very important bills that will provide clear and transparent policies for our pipeline permitting processes, making them more efficient and effective so that we can fully realize the North American energy boom; create American jobs; grow our economy; and strengthen our relations with our largest energy trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

The first bill, H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for

Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, is sponsored by my colleague, Mr. FLORES of Texas.

□ 1245

This bill reinforces the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's role as the lead agency for siting interstate natural gas pipelines by directing it to identify and invite all agencies considering an aspect of an application to establish a schedule for concurrent reviews, and to impose deadlines for final decisions.

Recent advancements in energy exploration have allowed companies to tap into previously inaccessible natural gas reserves, leading to a dramatic increase in domestic production. The increased supply has lowered energy costs and increased demand for natural gas.

As a result, current U.S. pipelines are now operating near capacity, making new pipelines necessary to deliver gas to consumers across the Nation, especially to those in the Northeast and Midwest, where demand for energy is high, but where they lack the infrastructure to deliver domestic natural gas. Additionally, due to its abundance and affordability, many manufacturers are beginning to rely on natural gas as a primary fuel.

Unfortunately, the permitting process for new pipelines is arduous and unnecessarily burdensome. Currently, when siting a pipeline project, multiple permits are required, including permits under the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Clean Air Act, for example. According to the Government Accountability Office, the average processing time from pre-filing to certification for interstate natural gas pipelines has been 558 days. We cannot afford to wait that long, Mr. Speaker.

It is critical that we expand and modernize our Nation's pipeline infrastructure to ensure the access to affordable energy and affordable prices for consumers across the country. In order to do this, we simply must promote timely and efficient reviews as well as coordination among Federal, State, and local regulators. This bill accomplishes these goals, and I support its passage.

The rule we are discussing today also provides for consideration of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN). This bill creates a uniform and transparent process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international transfers of oil, natural gas, and electricity imports and exports.

The bill directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review cross-border oil and natural gas pipelines and the Department of Energy to review cross-border electric transmission facilities, requiring the relevant official to issue a certificate of crossing, unless it is found not to be in the public interest.

Recent advances in technology, Mr. Speaker, have dramatically increased our ability to harness our vast natural resources, but the current ad hoc permitting process has inhibited energy producers from exporting American-made energy to our international trading partners and has significantly delayed recent proposals, such as the Keystone XL pipeline.

The value of energy traded between the United States and its North American neighbors exceeded \$140 billion in 2015, with \$100 billion in U.S. energy imports, and over \$40 billion in exports. We simply cannot afford to gamble our energy security and competitiveness on an inefficient permitting process.

Today's rule, Mr. Speaker, also allows for consideration of H.R. 218, the King Cove Road Land Exchange Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). This bill authorizes an equal value land exchange to facilitate the construction of an 11-mile road linking the remote city of King Cove and the city of Cold Bay, which has a modern airport. The State of Alaska will transfer approximately 43,000 acres to the Department of the Interior to add to the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge in return for 206 acres of Federal lands to build the road.

This road is critical, Mr. Speaker, because harsh winter conditions make transporting individuals in the remote King Cove community of nearly 1,000 people dangerous and sometimes fatal: gale-force winds ground planes and prevent sea travel; evacuations can take days; and the hovercraft terminal and medical facility that Congress temporarily provided funds for, in lieu of land for the road, ceased operation in 2010.

The King Cove community has been denied proper hospital care and access to essential emergency services since they began fighting for this road 40 years ago, and that, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable.

Ensuring these folks have ground transportation options for accessing the regional hub at Cold Bay, especially during harsh winters, is vital to the safety of this community in emergency situations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I encourage support for the rule for these important bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today would put some of our most sensitive lands at risk and limit the voices of experts, all to further construction of dangerous projects that could harm local communities.

First, H.R. 2883 undermines the National Environmental Policy Act and tips the scales in favor of massive, controversial oil and gas pipeline and electric transmission projects. Trans-boundary projects like this often travel for hundreds of miles, last for decades,

and pass through sensitive and Native lands and important aquifers. And, as we all know, pipelines leak.

That is why there is currently a rigorous Federal review process that takes into account the impact of these projects on the environment and the communities along their route.

Today, in order to construct an oil pipeline, a natural gas pipeline, or an electrical transmission line that crosses the U.S. border with Canada or Mexico, a Presidential permit must first be obtained, as well as additional approvals from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—FERC—the Department of Energy, or the Department of Defense, depending on the type of pipeline.

This review process helps us to understand the environmental impact of these projects and it allows communities and landowners along the route to weigh in with their concerns. All of this helps to keep communities safe from hazardous substances that, if spilled or ignited, could have catastrophic consequences. Yet the majority is proposing this measure to severely limit that rigorous review.

The bill effectively exempts these massive projects from environmental and safety review under the National Environmental Policy Act. It narrows the approval process and environmental review to just the "cross-border segment" of projects that physically cross the border with Canada or Mexico rather than, presently, the entire trans-boundary project. So inside the United States, anything goes.

Instead of requiring an agency to affirmatively find a project is in the public interest, the bill also places a burden of proof on the opponents of the project to show that it is not in the public interest. If that wasn't bad enough, the legislation would also give new life to the controversial projects that have already been denied, for very good reason, by allowing permits to be resubmitted under this sham process.

Second, H.R. 2910 would supercharge the natural gas pipeline approval process, putting private property rights in jeopardy and hindering important environmental reviews.

The bill gives the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission almost complete authority and severely limits the input of expert entities tasked with protecting the environment, our natural resources, and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind those watching today just how streamlined the natural gas pipeline approval process already is. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is basically a rubber-stamp entity. It almost never denies a pipeline project. On average, 88 percent of projects are approved within 1 year, and then we think about the consequences later.

In fact, FERC officials have testified that what is mostly slowing down the applications is that the applicants themselves fail to submit the necessary information to perform congressionally

mandated project reviews. So this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

Third, H.R. 218 revives an ill-advised proposal to build a road to the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge and its world-class wetlands.

This proposal has been, as pointed out for a number of decades, rejected by multiple State and Federal agencies on numerous occasions over the past 30 years. It has been exhaustively studied time and time again, and, every single time, the results have been clear. The road is not the most viable option for the residents of King Cove and would do irreparable damage to the refuge.

Yet the majority is ignoring three decades of expert analysis and public input in an effort to green light this damaging road through a congressionally designated wilderness area. More efficient and viable options exist, including the addition of a heliport and construction of a new airport, which we should be focusing on because a road is the wrong approach.

Mr. Speaker, we all know this, but I think we do need to be reminded from time to time that we are the stewards of our environment and this planet and the land only while we are alive. None of us ever really own it. We do, however, have an obligation to protect it, care for it, and make sure that it exists for future generations. These bills fail that test.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), my friend and colleague, and the sponsor of H.R. 218.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I listened to people on the other side. This is a good rule. I want to compliment the Rules Committee.

It is crucially important to recognize that this is an issue that means lives: 19 people have died out of that community of King Cove—mothers, children, husbands, brothers, uncles, and aunts—because they didn't have a road.

We passed legislation similar to this in 2009 that granted a land exchange—and was a massive land exchange—of 43,000 acres for 260 acres from the State of Alaska to construct this road. I think that is a fair exchange for an 11-mile road—single lane, gravel covered—just so they have access to save lives.

Those who speak against it have never experienced the wind that howls through that area when you try to land a plane or take off, you have a sick person with you, and you crash. Or go across the bay when waves are 30 feet high, and the evacuation of those ill people to an area that is only 11 miles away on an unfinished road and they die. Human beings, Alaskan constituents, that have medical aid only 600 miles away and stopped by 11 miles that is not allowed because supposedly there is a better way. And there is no

better way than a road in the weather condition I am speaking of.

When you think about it, I often listen to the other side of the aisle in voting against something like this, yet they will defend the right to save certain animals, but they don't want to save human life. That is wrong.

This is a good project. It should be built. I am hoping this body recognizes that lives are important and recognize the fact that this road doesn't disturb any of the wildlife. It is ironic that they will say it is going to disturb the geese that live off of eelgrass. The closest road that comes to this one bay is 11 miles away—11 miles. And the same area as this wildlife range has miles of road in it already, miles of road already in place. One of those roads already in place goes right by the lagoon where the tourists go watch the geese.

Now, why can't a tourist go by an area and watch the geese and it doesn't disturb them, but if someone is sick, dying, in a bus, ambulance, car, or truck, that is going to disturb the geese?

This is a nonsense argument by environmental communities around this Nation that want to put a stop to anything that benefits mankind and save the wildlife, say from New York or San Francisco, and don't know what they are talking about.

□ 1300

My job is to protect my people. This is not going to cost the taxpayers a nickel. This is going to be a project that is well done, and it will not disturb the wildlife they are so-called trying to protect.

So I ask my colleagues on this floor to think about humanity. Think about that person, be it your mother, your daughter, your son, your aunt, your uncle, your brother, and you would want to see them die because they are trying to protect a goose?

Shame on you. Shame on those who vote against this bill, saying: This is more important—I live in New York or California. This goose is more important than human life.

I think it is time we use a little sense in this body, a little understanding. Let's build this road. Let's pass this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative PASCRELL of New Jersey's Bring Jobs Home Act, H.R. 685. This bill will close the tax loophole that rewards companies from moving jobs overseas, while providing a tax credit to companies that move jobs back to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and spokesman for the other side.

Before I give my remarks, I don't think this is an either/or proposition, Mr. Speaker. Some of the things that my friend from Alaska just talked about make sense. There is nothing more essential than life. But this is a bill that has been put in with other bills as well. So I rise in opposition to the rule, Mr. Speaker.

This week, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade held our first hearing of the year, which was on NAFTA. You would think, from the President's rhetoric on trade, that many on the other side in Congress would be focused on creating good-paying, middle-class jobs and boosting our manufacturing base. You would think that. But, instead, we are here debating a bill, a number of bills, that are an assault on private property rights and the environment in the name of corporate profit and expediency.

Lo, what happened in 1923 that led to a change in our Tax Code when we tried to privatize public property and public resources. It was the biggest scandal of the 20th century.

Where are the jobs that were supposed to be coming back from overseas under this administration? Where are the higher middle class wages? Where are the policies coming from this Congress that support workers and their families?

The majority of Americans, Mr. Speaker, agree that keeping United States jobs from moving overseas should be a top priority. Yet, despite the empty promises made by this President, the flow of jobs overseas has not stopped by any barometer.

This administration has awarded government contracts to companies that continue to offshore our jobs. Think about that. Our tax money is still going to corporate America that sends jobs overseas to help those companies send jobs overseas. Now, if that makes any sense, I will listen to the rationale.

We don't stop companies from offshoring American jobs by holding rallies. We do it by making good policy, an exercise this administration and this majority-led Congress have refused to engage in. If they want to change that, they can start right now.

Under current law, when companies move overseas, we give them a tax break for the cost—a tax break. That is the law.

We need to stop offshoring now. The Congress can defeat the previous question and bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill eliminates this tax deduction and gives a tax credit of up to 20 percent of the cost to United States

businesses that bring jobs back to the United States of America. The companies would have to add jobs to claim the credit.

I have also introduced legislation, the Jobs and Trade Competitiveness Act, that builds on the Bring Jobs Home Act and further strengthens enforcement against countries that cheat our trade laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. I encourage my colleagues to look at it.

So let's stop subsidizing companies that ship jobs overseas and start bringing jobs back to our shores. It doesn't get much simpler than that, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a new idea. President Obama and Democrats in Congress have raised this bill for years. The Republican House has blocked our bill at every turn. Senator STABENOW of Michigan leads this bill in the Senate, where it cleared a procedural vote in 2014, 93-7.

President Trump has declared this week Made In America Week. I challenge you today to stop the small talk and put your money where your mouth is. Take up and pass this bill to stand up for American manufacturing and the workers here at home who need it.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act and start bringing jobs back to the United States.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I share my colleague's dedication to job creation, and what we know is that the kind of job creation we need in this Nation can only come with access to reliable, affordable sources of energy. Our fossil fuels in this country are a national treasure, and these bills that are being considered under this rule today are bills that would help to streamline the regulatory process.

We have been, Mr. Speaker, really facing a war on fossil fuels during the course of the last 8 years. We have seen these industries targeted, completely unfairly targeted, based on some notion that, by shutting down our fossil fuel industry, we are somehow going to be able to continue to have economic growth. We have seen the environmental officials of the previous administration even admit before this body that things like the Clean Power Plan would result, if fully implemented, in a negligible impact on the environment.

So, again, I think that it is important to recognize that it is at the center of the agenda that we are pushing forward, frankly, with historic progress in this Congress to begin to generate the kind of economic growth that we really need to get back on track.

We have been stagnant now for 8 years. We have seen overreach from the Federal Government. We have seen a situation in which companies, industry, individuals, and small businesses are strangled by regulatory red tape.

No one is suggesting that there shouldn't be oversight. No one is suggesting that there shouldn't be environmental review, but what we know is we have got to streamline it.

We cannot be in a position where bureaucrats—and, frankly, it is often unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.—impose absolutely unattainable restrictions, impose rules that our industry can't meet and prevent us from being able to have access to our own energy sources. Again, it is that reliable, affordable energy that will allow our economy to grow and bring back the jobs that the gentleman says, and to which I agree, are so important for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to speak on behalf of H.R. 2910, Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, and the potential impact it could have on our Nation.

Right now, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, is the lead agency for coordinating required reviews and authorizations for interstate natural gas pipelines. In order to start a pipeline project, you need multiple permits from a variety of platforms as well as coordination from Federal, State, and local governments.

As history has shown us time and time again, a multistep approval process just does not work. Mixing three different levels of government has and always will be a recipe for total disaster. It makes for unnecessary delays that are caused by too many cooks in the kitchen.

I fully support my friend and colleague Representative BILL FLORES' bill that will promote more timely and efficient reviews. We need to strengthen FERC's lead agency role that it was designed to create accountability and transparency.

Overall, this bill will encourage more timely and efficient reviews and keep energy prices affordable for all Americans. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

In God we trust.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can take up the legislation that has just been outlined by Mr. PASCRELL.

There is no more responsibility that we have than creating good-paying jobs for the American people; and this is, after all, according to President Trump, "Make It in America" Week, which, in fact, is a centerpiece of the Democratic agenda. We have a number of bills that are designed to help rein-vigorate and strengthen American manufacturing.

It is shocking for the American people to learn that we have a Tax Code, as Mr. PASCRELL outlined, that gives a tax break to companies that ship American jobs overseas, exactly the opposite of what it should be if we are really concerned about creating good-paying jobs here in our own country. So defeating the previous question means we could take up the stop offshoring now legislation, which would get rid of this nonsensical provision in our Tax Code.

When you go out there and talk to constituents, you say: One of the reasons we can't keep good manufacturing jobs here in America is because we incentivize, we use some of your tax dollars to incentivize companies to ship those jobs overseas. It makes no sense.

So how about, during "Make It in America" Week, rather than just using that phrase, as the President has done, let's do something that will actually help promote making things in this country—I know, probably a challenging concept for the President, who does his manufacturing overseas, not in the United States.

Let's take a bold step today. Remove that provision of the Tax Code, and have a Tax Code provision that actually incentivizes creating jobs in our own country and giving tax credits to companies that create jobs in America. What a novel idea.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can take this piece of legislation up, and perhaps it will then encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to move forward on a number of bills that are part of the Democratic Make It in America agenda to help rebuild American manufacturing and put people back to work in good-paying jobs.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I understand that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to talk about energy. They don't want to talk about fossil fuels. They don't want to talk about how important these are to the economy.

I would propose, Mr. Speaker, maybe what we should do is turn out the lights in this Chamber. Maybe we ought to turn off the air conditioning, Mr. Speaker, and we could have the debate in the dark, which is where we would be, frankly, if we followed the energy policies in the approach of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

These bills are hugely important, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we are able to continue to get access to the energy that we need; and it is crucially important that we not skip over the burden that has been caused by the Federal Government, by the regulatory burden we have been feeling, and that we take action, as is our responsibility, to begin to help to roll back that over-reach, to begin to help to provide some relief so that we can, in fact, get the jobs back that our colleagues say they

desire so much and that we know we need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be recognized by the gentlewoman from Wyoming, and I rise in support of this combined rule that we have here.

I thought it was important that I speak to some of the provisions that are in the underlying bill and also the provisions that are not in the underlying bill.

□ 1315

I would characterize this rule, that is the rule for the reauthorization of the Department of Homeland Security—it is actually the authorization. It has never been authorized in that fashion before—the authorization of Homeland Security after 15 years. I think that it does a lot of good things in that it lays out a definition and frames the duties of the Department of Homeland Security broadly and pretty closely in their entirety.

There are some things that are missing from this that I would like to have plugged into this reauthorization language. However, I believe the goal was, all along, to draft a piece of reauthorization language that would be, I will say, compatible to both sides of the aisle and without particular dissent.

Therefore, we have a piece of legislation that isn't as impactful as I would like, and yet it is here on the floor under suspension with the idea that we can move this along and frame the Department of Homeland Security's duties in the fashion that is here.

I don't object to the provisions that are in the authorization language that exists, but I would point out that it sets the stage, and now there is an agreement that has been reached through a number of entities, including the White House, the DOJ, the DHS, and I understand from our leadership and others, that soon there will be the piece of legislation that we refer to as Davis-Oliver.

In Davis-Oliver, we actually have the enforcement provisions that are necessary to restore the respect for the rule of law, and especially the domestic enforcement of our immigration laws.

We are setting the stage for that and clearing the path for that with this rule on the legislation that will pass, I believe, under suspension.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The provisions that are necessary that I would point out to the body, Mr. Speaker, are this:

The number one most important is this: We only have 5,000 ICE agents for 50 States and territories. They are spread so thin they can't possibly enforce immigration law. We need that number tripled. That is 10,000 ICE agents. That is the most important component of this to have the officers to bring that enforcement.

Second thing is we need to make sure that the ICE detainer language is there and in Davis-Oliver. That is something that had been neutralized by an action of the Obama administration, and they need to be certain that they have the full authority to carry firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I make these points so that the body can anticipate what is coming down the pike. I intend to support the rule and the underlying bills, and I intend to be here on the floor advocating all of the components of Davis-Oliver, also including the components I have articulated here today.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people may be scratching their heads wondering why, with everything going on in the world, we are prioritizing bills that put our environment at risk—bills the Senate may never take up.

Let me remind them that the majority is just doing the bidding of an administration that has shown a complete disregard for air, water, and land. The administration has already proposed a budget that would slash the Environmental Protection Agency by 32 percent. This would harm not only conservation and climate efforts, but thousands of jobs nationwide.

As a microbiologist, I know firsthand the importance of science in our legislative process, yet the majority has refused to give science and facts their rightful place in policy debates that we have.

From drastically reducing funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, and by discrediting climate change, to attempting to eliminate safeguards for our genetic privacy, the majority and this administration have worked hand in hand to ruthlessly roll back the scientific advancements that we have made.

It is shameful that we are here today considering bills that would silence experts and risk the health and safety of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question on the rule and the bills, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to be here, and I am proud of the agenda that we have taken up under the Republican leadership in this Congress. We are indeed doing the important work that the people sent us here to do.

So far, just a list of some of the things that we have done in the first few months of this Congress: We have taken the first step in our obligation to repeal and replace ObamaCare, a system that is absolutely failing, that is causing rising premiums. It is causing people to lose their insurance all across the Nation, a system that will collapse if we don't fix it. We, the House Republicans, have taken important steps in order to begin the repeal and replace process of ObamaCare.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have passed a bill to repeal and replace Dodd-Frank, legislation that was strangling our local community banks across the country. We have taken a step to begin to fix that and provide relief.

We have also dealt with important immigration issues and taken important action in terms of passing legislation to end human trafficking.

I am very proud, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, of the work that we have done to pass the National Defense Authorization Act to begin to rebuild our military and get the military the resources it needs so that it can defend us against a growing array of threats and a very complex array of enemies across the Nation.

We have also, Mr. Speaker, taken important steps using the congressional review action process to repeal regulations put in place over the last 8 years that have been damaging to our industry, to individuals, to small businesses all across the Nation.

We have been historically productive, and it may be that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't agree with the steps that we have taken, but it is simply not accurate to say we aren't focusing on what is important. We are focusing on those issues that matter most to the men and women across this Nation that will begin to make sure we can keep everybody safe, begin to make sure we can defend ourselves, begin the process of reforming our outdated and burdensome tax code, as well, Mr. Speaker, as ensuring we bring back the kind of economic growth we know we need and fixing our healthcare system.

These bills that we are debating today, the rule for these bills, are part of that process. I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. YOUNG, for their hard work on this legislation.

In Wyoming, which is one of our Nation's largest energy-producing States, we know how important it is that we work to develop our domestic energy resources. We know the technology that has been available that has helped us do that, that has helped us begin to, for the first time ever, have energy independence that has really helped us begin to have the kind of economic growth we need.

We cannot depend just on that technology. We also have got to improve the permitting process, Mr. Speaker. Improving the pipeline permitting process by promoting the kind of timely review, supporting interagency coordination, and creating a new and streamlined system for safety that will help us to transport our energy exports and imports are all crucial steps in our ability to ensure affordable energy and economic growth.

The other bill that we are considering under this rule, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 218, will provide a desperately needed road, as you heard my colleague Mr. YOUNG explain, to improve the safety and well-being of the residents

of King Cove, Alaska, and save lives, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, I urge adoption of both the rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 454 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 685) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 685.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to the House of Representatives and the American people.

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed his tax return information to the public;

Whereas, the chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, Joint Committee on

Taxation, and the Committee on Finance have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas, pursuant to Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, often referred to as the Origination Clause, the House of Representatives has the sole authority to initiate legislation that raises revenue for the national government, and the Committee on Ways and Means is considering a comprehensive reform of the Tax Code;

Whereas, President Donald J. Trump holds interests as the sole or principal owner in approximately 500 separate business entities, and the President's tax plan proposes to cut the corporate tax from 35 percent to 15 percent, applicable to many of these entities;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses, has instead placed his assets in a trust which is run by his adult children, and the President can withdraw profits from his trust at any time of his choosing from any of the companies he owns;

Whereas, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, Walter Shaub, resigned on July 6, 2017, stating that "There isn't much more I could accomplish at the Office of Government Ethics, given the current situation. O.G.E.'s recent experiences have made it clear that the ethics program needs to be strengthened";

Whereas, according to media reports analyzing President Trump's leaked 2005 tax return, had his own tax plan been in place, he would have paid an estimated 3.48 percent rate instead of a 24 percent rate, saving him \$31.3 million in that year alone;

Whereas, without access to the President's tax returns, the American people cannot determine how much he will personally benefit from proposed changes to the Tax Code or from policy decisions he makes, nor can the American people fully understand the financial interests and motivations of the President;

Whereas, in June 2017, President Trump filed an updated financial disclosure with the Office of Government Ethics which showed that the President reported \$37.2 million income from the Mar-a-Lago resort between January 2016 and April 2017 where he hosted the President of China and from where he ordered missile strikes against Syria;

Whereas, during the same time period, President Trump reported \$288 million in income from all his golf courses, including \$19.7 million from his course in Bedminster, New Jersey;

Whereas, over the weekend of July 14, President Trump sent out eight tweets promoting the U.S. Women's Open Golf Tournament which took place at his Bedminster club;

Whereas, Mar-a-Lago doubled its new member fees to \$200,000 immediately following the 2016 election, and President Trump personally benefits from such new member fees;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns would help those investigating Russian interference in the 2016 election and assist them in better understanding the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation, Russian businesses, and Russian individuals;

Whereas, in 2013, President Trump said, "Well, I've done a lot of business with the Russians. They're smart and they're tough," and President Trump's son, Donald Trump, Jr., told a news outlet in 2008 that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets";

Whereas, President Trump fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James

Comey, who was overseeing an investigation into ties and any collusion between the Russian Government and President Trump's campaign;

Whereas, former Director Comey testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that President Trump asked him to "let go" of an investigation into former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn's business ties to Russia;

Whereas, President Trump stated on May 11, 2017, that he had decided that he was going to fire Comey because of "this Russia thing";

Whereas, at the G-20 Hamburg summit on July 7, 2017, President Trump took a more than 2 hour closed-door meeting with President Vladimir Putin, after which he claimed that he "strongly pressed" President Putin on Russian interference in U.S. elections and that it is "time to move forward";

Whereas, on June 9, 2016, then-Candidate Trump's son, Donald Trump, Jr., then-Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort, and Trump son-in-law and current White House adviser Jared Kushner met with a person described as "a Russian government attorney," and a former Russian military intelligence officer who promised to offer incriminating information about Hillary Clinton which had been collected as part of a Russian Government effort to assist President Trump in his campaign for President;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means has in the past used the authority under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means has now voted three times along party lines to continue to conceal President Trump's tax returns;

Whereas, the House of Representatives has now refused ten times to act on President Trump's tax returns;

Whereas, the Committee on the Judiciary has failed to conduct even basic oversight on the connections between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign;

Whereas, the Committee on the Judiciary has now voted twice along party lines to decline to request documents detailing the Trump administration's ties with Russian officials;

Whereas, the House of Representatives undermines its dignity and the integrity of its proceedings by continuing the cover-up of President Trump's tax returns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return and return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as well as the tax return, and return information with respect to the President's businesses, of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e, specifically each corporation and each partnership, within the meaning of subchapter K of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, where he is listed as an officer, director, or equivalent, or exercises working control; and

2. Postpone consideration of tax reform legislation until the elected Representatives of the American people in this House have obtained President Trump's tax returns and return information to ascertain how any changes to the Tax Code might financially benefit the President.

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island wish to present argument on the parliamentary question of whether the resolution